FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE
February 11, 2015
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening 1

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Progress Update 1

Cesium Storage Follow-up 6

Open Forum 11

Committee Business 12

Attachments 14

Attendees 15

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Dirk Dunning, Tank Waste Committee (TWC) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee adopted the January 2015 meeting summary with minor revisions.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Progress Update

Introduction

Bob Suyama, TWC vice chair and issue manager, provided the committee with context for the progress update on the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), noting that a primary goal of the conversation was to build a better understanding of the WTP Communication Plan that the U.S. Department of Energy—Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) requested through the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) work plan. Bob noted that the Communication Plan was a non-traditional deliverable, and that the TWC still had many questions surrounding its creation process, form, and format.

Agency Presentation

Bill Hamel, DOE-ORP, presented TWC with an update on progress at the WTP and clarified the role of the HAB in the development of a WTP Communication Plan. Bill noted that the Board has a wealth of knowledge and experience, and that DOE-ORP would like to harness this expertise to better communicate WTP progress to the public. Board members are able to approach a highly complex facility like the WTP from both an agency and a public perspective. Key points from Bill's WTP update included:

- The High-Level Waste (HLW) strategy and design process has addressed several of the ongoing vulnerabilities within the WTP system. HLW Facility construction had been at a standstill because the safety basis was not in alignment with the design basis. The approved Safety Design Strategy and the Gap Analysis are working to bring the safety basis and design basis back into alignment.

- Review of the HLW Facility is ongoing, and current work is focused on technical issues and Pre-treatment Facility. Problem areas have been identified and efforts are looking at which solutions are best (e.g. current design of ventilation systems). The next step in the process will be to bring identified solutions up to the baseline and project the scope of work. Once those details have been settled, DOE-ORP can look into planning and pricing the baseline. Contract negotiations with Bechtel Corporation (Bechtel) will follow.

- The contract with Bechtel needs to be drafted first, but re-baselining needs to occur very quickly after the contract is settled.

- With relation to direct-feed pre-conceptual design engineering, DOE-ORP authorizes not to exceed amounts (NTE)—contractual mechanisms that support renegotiations and allow progress to be made while details are finalized. Both NTEs and ongoing renegotiations are moving forward.

Regulator Perspective

Dan McDonald, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated that in addition to the importance of solving the component and equipment issues, regulators will also conduct a system-level review of the WTP. DOE-ORP has implemented a One System Management Approach (incorporating the tank farms, WTP, etc.), and Dan recognized that the HAB may benefit from a briefing on this topic in the future. Dan noted that the WTP design permits may no longer be valid, as the components that are currently on the permit might not be the final components used in an updated WTP engineering design. Dan closed by noting that the path forward for solving WTP alignment issues is clear in some cases, while in others it is not.

*Committee Questions and Responses**

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Has Ecology weighed in on the design process?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] At the moment, there are only engineering efforts that are ongoing. Permitting will be a next step. DOE-ORP is not yet at the point of proposing a WTP design to Ecology. Regulator design reviews will need to be done in the future.*

Q. At what point will Ecology and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have the opportunity to review any contingency that is built into the WTP?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] No decisions have yet been made concerning contingencies—engineers are still at the point of analyzing how to best bring solutions up to the baseline and project the scope of work. This analysis must be done very thoughtfully.*

Q. As review of WTP design is ongoing, is there the assumption that TPA milestones will need to be negotiated and changed?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] At the moment, milestone changes will likely be decided in the resolution of the Consent Decree (CD).*
>
> *R. [Ecology] In some cases, strategies for bringing milestones and engineering into alignment is clear; in others it is not.*

Q. Many things at the WTP have been cast in concrete. Physical changes to the facility that result from recent engineering reviews may be difficult to implement in already constructed areas. How will DOE-ORP manage these updates?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] Through the HLW Facility review, vulnerabilities have been identified. DOE-ORP is working to address these vulnerabilities. DOE will make needed changes to ensure safe, efficient operations of the WTP. The agency is still exploring the best strategies for physical implementation of solutions, and any needed physical implementations will be carried out in a very mindful way.*

Q. There was a probabilistic assessment that released a new seismic standard for the Hanford Site that peaks at 0.58g. It is also in a different frequency band than the existing standard. Will this have any impact on WTP design?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] As the WTP design has been underway, some of the orders have changed. When these orders are released, DOE-ORP evaluates whether or not it makes sense to return to facility design. In some cases, DOE-ORP will ask Bechtel to provide a design analysis. This analysis is currently underway for facility safety, and this includes the natural phenomenon hazard analysis.*

* **Attachment 1**: Transcribed Flipcharts

Q. Could you expand upon the Reliability Validation Process (RVP) at the WTP? There were a huge array of problems that were demonstrated, especially at the HLW Facility.

R. [DOE-ORP] Bechtel did a self-analysis RVP. In return to production engineering, there are a set of process gates. These are checks and over-checks—such things as going back and re-doing calculations. These process gates are intended to preclude moving forward without solving potential issues. The reviews of the HLW Facility ensure that any errors or miscalculations are caught. The process gates enhance these checks. DOE-ORP needs to ensure that these processes are in place to solve issues as they arise.

Q. What is DOE-ORP looking for the Board to deliver as a product for the WTP Communication Plan?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE would like to see a strategy. The agency would like to harness the Board's ability to look both outward and see inward. The strategy should note areas that DOE-ORP should communicate better with the public, avenues for outreach, and audiences that the agency should be talking to.

C. With regard to a Communication Plan, many of the WTP issues are difficult to communicate now because of uncertainty related to the Consent Decree.

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP is moving forward with work at the WTP because it is important to do so. It is very important that efforts keep moving forward. It is difficult to communicate progress with the CD being in the media so often—the perception exists that work at the WTP is at a standstill. The Communication Plan could help DOE-ORP message ongoing progress more appropriately. Describe the critical messages that your contingencies would like to understand. DOE-ORP believes this strategy and the critical messages will allow the HAB to communicate information about the WTP Project with greater flexibility.

C. DOE-ORP does not have an adequate systems program in place for the WTP. Small systems interact with larger systems, all the way up to a policy-level. Linking these systems has always been an area for improvement.

R. [DOE-ORP] That is an insightful point. DOE-ORP is currently working to strengthen our systems approach through the agency's review efforts. Once problems are identified and potential solutions are enumerated, review can escalate to the next system.

C. Comments are routinely made that the WTP will never work and that it is a sinkhole for money. The most important things to communicate are improvements that have been made to safety and to quality. There is DOE-ORP internal safety, Bechtel internal safety. These checks need to be demonstrated to the public. There has been so much pushback and many different contractors over the years, the public needs to see evidence of positive, actual accomplishments at the WTP complex. People, taxpayers, employees, contractors, and DOE all need to have faith that the WTP is going to work.

R. [DOE-ORP] That is valuable perspective that will hopefully be included in the HAB's WTP Communication Plan. It would be helpful to take that perspective, and then frame a strategy.

C. One concern that the Board has with the WTP Communication Plan—the HAB is not a cheerleader for DOE's projects. The idea of sharing good news and progress that is measurable is good. The message of "progress is being made" is also good. However, until there is a paradigm shift at the WTP, the idea of getting the public behind the project feels hollow. Things at the WTP are not on track, and there are big questions that still need to be answered.

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The Board does not have to advocate for any DOE strategy in the WTP Communication Plan. The report should only detail best practices and strategies for communicating ongoing progress at the WTP complex.*

C. The pause in WTP construction created the perception that there are major problems with the WTP design. Former U.S. Secretary of Energy Steven Chu formed a panel to see what the problems were, but the public was never made privy to that panel's conclusions. Therefore, the public knows that there are problems, but the public does not know what those problems are nor what the solutions to those problems may be. If DOE-ORP's goal is meaningful interactions with the public, the first step is to begin interacting with the public more.

> *R. [DOE-ORP] There was never any report that Secretary Chu's panel released. The panel simply came together to discuss the ongoing technical issues. The efforts of Secretary Chu's team led directly to the creation of current U.S. Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz's Framework document. The WTP panel facilitated change, and any outcomes from the effort were put into practice, not into a report.*

C. [DOE-ORP] The One System Integrated Project Team would be a good resource for the TWC. The group recently developed a briefing that would provide the committee with a good understanding of how DOE-ORP plans to integrate WTP and tank farm operations.

> *C. It would be very beneficial for the committee to receive this presentation. The briefing may also be a good tool for communicating with the public and demonstrating where they can get information and provide future comment. The public will not understand engineering matters, and providing overly technical information may only serve to push them away. The first step is for the committee to become more familiar with the One System approach.*
>
> *C. [Ecology] The One System Management Approach is currently framed at a very high level, and it is not tooled for potential CD outcomes. Until the legal issues are complete, the One System presentation will not be able to provide a holistic picture of how waste treatment at the Hanford Site will move forward.*
>
> *C. [DOE-ORP] The CD outcome may cause waste treatment to move forward in a different way, but there are certain infrastructure needs that will remain constant. The site is not at a standstill at the moment, and this could be better communicated to the public.*

C. Could the One System Management Approach provide the Board with a better idea of where the WTP is going?

R. [DOE-ORP] The goal of the One System approach is to allow all of the waste treatment systems to work together appropriately at startup. That connection that the systems must share needs to be both physical and documented. There are also several upper-level activities, such as updating regulator permits, that DOE-ORP has incorporated into the One System approach. The One System program is big—it looks beyond tank farms and the WTP, and includes Richland Operations assets, roads, electricity, etc. These infrastructure needs are assumed available in the future to support the WTP; however, One System will ensure that they actually will be to the extent that they are needed.

C. The CD arbitration impacts the Board's ability to construct a meaningful Communication Plan, as it limits the Board's ability to access needed documents. The committee will also have a difficult time knowing who is able to provide issue managers with additional information.

C. The CD arbitration introduces incredible uncertainty into the coming years. The outcome of the arbitration may fundamentally change the direction of the WTP as the Board currently understands it. Any information presented to the public needs to be factual; presenting the public with information that may change dramatically is not a good idea. If, for example, an outcome of the CD arbitration is that new tanks need to be built, that represents a dramatic shift in Hanford Site funding and priorities.

C. The Board's Executive Issues Committee (EIC) looked into the WTP Communication Plan task, and decided that the deliverable does fall under the purview of the Board. The next steps in the process of creating this document is for issue managers to create an outline. There are certain ideas that will need to be included in the outline; the CD and the role of the HAB are both very important to note.

C. It would be advantageous to explore potential directions for the report before the upcoming March 2015 TWC meeting. Following the in-person discussion, issue managers could meet to see if there are any questions that DOE-ORP needs to answer before moving forward.

The committee thanked Bill for the information and clarification that he provided. Bob noted that topic issue managers would begin to construct an outline for the WTP Communication Plan in the coming month and that the committee would have the opportunity to discuss progress and information needs at the March 2015 TWC meeting.

Cesium Storage Follow-up

Introduction

Dave Bernhard, issue manager, provided the committee with a brief introduction to the Cesium Storage follow-up discussion. Dave reminded the committee that DOE-ORP has decided to construct a Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DF LAW) Facility to remove low-activity waste (LAW) from the tank farms and bypass pre-treatment. However, as this waste will not move to the HLW Facility, any cesium removed from the LAW will not move into a final, vitrified state with the rest of the LAW stream. Therefore, the cesium must be stored until it can be processed at the HLW Facility. Dave noted that current option for cesium storage involves returning it to double-shell tanks to await HLW vitrification at

a later time. Dave noted that additional strategies for cesium removed from LAW could include grouting it or storing it in a canister for eventual shipment to a deep geological repository. DOE-ORP has requested that the TWC explore alternative cesium management strategies and author a memo or report detailing these potential avenues for storage.

Agency Presentation

Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP, noted that DOE-ORP is hopeful that the deliverable requested from the HAB on this topic will go beyond advice. Steve stated that he would like to see the HAB develop a report that notes additional cesium storage strategies and includes pertinent background information and identified sources. Steve noted that the report could incorporate technical information, but national policy information would be most advantageous (e.g. policy considerations and regulatory processes). Steve provided the committee with additional information on cesium removal from LAW and current storage plans; key points from his briefing include:

- LAW will be run through the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS). Ion-exchange columns will use resin to strip cesium from the liquid waste. A caustic will then be applied to neutralize the cesium stream, and the stripped cesium will be sent back to the tank farms. This is the most cost-effective way to manage cesium removed from LAW.

- There are two options for the cesium capture media—elutable and non-elutable:

    - Elutable media (resin) can continue to function in the ion-exchange process over and over again. This will allow the LAWPS Facility to strip the cesium out of LAW and then be sent back to the tank farms. DOE-ORP's current plans for the LAWPS Facility incorporate use of this resin.

    - Non-elutable media (crystalline silicotitanate [CST]) cannot be reused. CST must be stored on a pad or disposed of in a repository or borehole once it is spent.

- CST captures cesium more effectively than the elutable resin. Savannah River currently uses CST medium to capture cesium from tank waste; however, there have been difficulties grinding up the cesium-rich CST for vitrification. Japan has also used CST to capture cesium at the Fukushima Site, but there is no disposal pathway currently in place for the spent media. Borehole disposal has largely been off the table in the United States, but this may be change in the future.

- There are modular vitrification facilities that could potentially be explored for use with cesium. Waste is melted within canisters via induction heating coils. Modular facilities do not make sense on a Hanford-wide scale, but they could potentially be used for cesium.

- At the moment, storage of vitrified cesium is an unanswered question. Cesium is currently classified as HLW, which means that it must eventually be placed in a deep geological repository.

Regulator Perspectives

Dan McDonald, Ecology, noted that the LAWPS Facility and cesium removal does not constitute a final solution for LAW—whatever medium is used, there is still the matter of cesium storage and disposal. He recognized that there are policy and technical issues associated with all forms of storage and disposal, and permitting will be no small task. Any facilities that are used to manage cesium —either existing, modified, or new—will need to be able to remotely handle HLW. Ecology is hopeful that the cesium will all end up in a glass form, and there are technical definitions that still need to be made relating to the composition of the glass and the shape of the canisters. Dan noted that there are additional considerations, as well, such as a final disposition site. If cesium is placed back into the tank farms, there are blending issues to consider, as well. Dan noted that cesium will need to be placed back into DSTs accordingly. Dan encouraged the Board to consider that all cesium will eventually need to be vitrified, and that the Board's report should be constructed with this key idea in mind.

*Committee Questions and Responses**

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. It was noted that sending cesium back to the tank farms was the most cost effective way to manage the waste. Did the cost analysis that led to this decision factor in the funding needs associated with a second round of cesium retrieval from the tanks?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The cost analysis may have incorporated this information or it may not have. DOE-ORP will look into this.*

Q. Is there a medical use for the cesium that is present in tank wastes?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] There is always a demand for certain isotopes. That is something that the Board's research could explore further.*

Q. What is the expected cesium volume for both the elutable and the non-elutable media options?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] Each time elution is done, there are a few thousand gallons of liquid waste that are transferred back to the tank farms. To some extent, this information is available, as DOE-ORP has characterized tank farm wastes. There is publically available information that may help the committee to answer additional questions. DOE-ORP would find it helpful for the Board to demonstrate the information sources that were explored in its report and the conclusions that the Board reached from that information. Other U.S. Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Boards have created reports such as this, and those reports may provide good examples for report form and format.*

Q. Is the information regarding cesium concentrations in the tank farms publically available?

* **Attachment 1**: Transcribed Flipcharts

R. [DOE-ORP] No, that information would be provided to the Board by DOE-ORP. The referenced publically available information would likely come from other parts of the world (e.g. Japan's strategies at the Fukushima Site).

Q. To begin the process of authoring the report, should the Board author a list of questions and information needs over the next month?

R. [DOE-ORP] Yes, that would be a strong starting point.

C. [DOE-ORP] For clarification on the purpose of the Board report—decisions have been made for moving forward, but there is still a process that is ongoing. DOE-ORP is still considering all options that are available for removing and storing cesium from LAW. DOE-ORP would appreciate feedback from the Board on this topic. DOE-ORP believes that the strategy of returning cesium to the tank farms makes the most sense in the short-term, but the agency would like to be sure that it has adequately considered all options. This is an opportunity for the Board to provide recommendations to DOE-ORP.

C. Through the report, the Board can contribute most usefully to the cesium storage discussion by identifying policy-level implementations. Cesium is classified as HLW; it decays quickly and has an immense heat- and gamma-load. The Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) is outdated and decaying quickly—there are issues with the high-efficiency particulate arrestance filters and the facility is generally hazardous.

C. There is a lot of cesium and strontium currently stored in WESF. If a permanent storage solution is found for the cesium removed from LAW, it could perhaps be extended to the WESF cesium. This could help to remove one of the Hanford Site's largest sources of radiation.

C. Boreholes have been discussed for years at the Hanford Site. In other parts of the world where boreholes have been used for waste deposition, such as Great Britain and Idaho, waste is often required to be dug up at a later date.

Q. How deep are the boreholes at the Nevada site?

R. [DOE-ORP] The Nevada Site underwent groundwater evaluation, and it was discovered that their waste sites will not have any interaction with groundwater. Boreholes were created in the mid-1990s.

C. The Nevada boreholes are 36 meters deep and un-cased.

Q. If a strong analysis were conducted, at what level could it be determined that boreholes at the Hanford Site would be safe? There is a need for nuclear waste disposal, and there is currently no deep geologic repository.

C. Not feeding the cesium back into the tank farms makes sense from both a worker safety and a risk-reduction perspective. The report should consider long-term approaches. If the technology is available, it makes the most sense to remove the cesium directly into a glass form. This, however, leads directly into the conversation of permanent disposal options for HLW.

Q. The idea of removing liquid from tanks, removing cesium and strontium, generating more waste, and then returning that waste to the tanks is a frustrating concept. It seems like DOE-ORP is planning to generate additional waste to remove some waste. The DFLAW plans appear to be put into place to simply demonstrate that something is happening on site; however, it may not be the correct course of action.

R. [DOE-ORP] Eighty percent of tank wastes are LAW. There is a lot of risk associated with leaving this waste within the tanks. Ultimately, DOE-ORP has decided to move forward with the current waste strategy. There will be some liquids that are returned to the tank, but it will be a very small percentage compared to the amount of liquids that will be removed and vitrified (approximately 10%). This will help to free up much-needed DST space.

Q. Will returning cesium to the tank farms increase the gamma radiation or heat-loads for tank farms?

R. [DOE-ORP] No, it will not. The concentrations of cesium may move between tanks as this work is accomplished, but the gamma- and heat-loads will remain the same for the tank farms.

Q. Why does the cesium have to be removed from the LAW?

R. [DOE-ORP] The decision was made a long time ago when it was noted that the tank farm liquid waste will only be classified as LAW once the cesium and the strontium are removed.

C. DOE-ORP initially wanted to classify liquid tank waste as low-level waste; however, due to public comments on 1995's tank closure Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), it was changed to low-activity high-level waste. Ultimately, products from the LAW Facility may all need to go to a deep geological repository because the legal definitions of the waste have never been changed.

C. It may not be a good idea for cesium to be disposed of in a deep geological repository because of the heat that it produces as it decays. Part of the issue is that cesium is defined as HLW.

C. Definitions are often confusing, and they mean different things to different people. The definition of HLW comes from the U.S. Congress. The Board sends copies of our advice to our congressional delegates, but the role of the HAB is to advise DOE, not the U.S. Congress.

C. The logical initial organization for the Board's report would be to begin with a list of potential storage options, and then evaluate these options for potential legality. Those that pass this test could be assigned a cost and a risk benefit, and a matrix could be created to facilitate further discussions on the topic.

C. A precursor to this idea could be for committee members to submit questions to topic issue managers. Questions may then be forwarded to DOE-ORP, and the answers could guide the Board's efforts. This will likely take approximately six months to a year to complete this report. Deliberate initial steps will influence the process.

C. A flowchart would be an intuitive incorporation into this report.

Issue managers for this topic include Dave Bernhard (lead), Bob Suyama, Richard Smith, Susan Leckband and Melanie Myers. The committee noted that the topic would likely be a standing agenda item in the coming months. Steve Pfaff closed discussion by noting that the LAWPS system is not scheduled

to begin until 2022 and the decision for returning cesium to tanks has already been made. The committee's efforts will inform waste disposition pathways in the future, and Steve recognized that it was more important that the HAB's report be deliberate and comprehensive as opposed to completed quickly.

Open Forum

*Meeting Summary Strategies**

Richard noted that he had a sustained interest in returning to verbatim transcripts of Hanford Advisory Board and Committee meetings, as opposed to meeting summaries. Richard identified that verbatim minutes are very useful for identifying individual statements and better at capturing nuances in HAB discussions. Steve Hudson, HAB Chair, and Susan Leckband, HAB Vice Chair, noted that comprehensive meeting minutes are more expensive to create and that the HAB budget was already under increased pressure. The Facilitation Team will discuss the matter with Board leadership and DOE.

*Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Update**

Melanie asked if there was an update on the ongoing Hanford site-wide Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) study. Joni Grindstaff, DOE-ORP, noted that she would look into the status of CRESP's ongoing work and provide the committee with an update at a future time.

HAB Work Plan Addition: Management of Tritiated Water

Dirk noted that the EIC is exploring a new strategy for adding topics to the 2015 HAB Work Plan, and he stated interest in gathering committee consensus to move forward with incorporating the topic of managing tritiated water at the Hanford Site into the list of TWC topics on the HAB Work Plan. Dirk noted that a Government Accountability Office report identified that Hanford tank waste would be run through the 242-A Evaporator to free nearly 3 million gallons of tank space. Water boiled away from tank waste is sent from the Evaporator to the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) and the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility. Dirk noted that this evaporated water contains levels of tritium that far exceed the drinking water standards, and Hanford does not currently have on-site technology available to remove tritium. Dirk enumerated five potential alternatives for dealing with tritiated water on-site:

1. Put the evaporated water back into a DST
2. Treat the water and discharge it into the Columbia River
3. Treat the water, condense it, and boil it into the air
4. Store the water for 100+ years until the tritium decays to safe levels

* **Attachment 1**: Transcribed Flipcharts
* **Attachment 1**: Transcribed Flipcharts

5. Treat the water to remove tritium (Dirk noted that there is a local company that is shipping technology for treating tritiated water to Japan)

Dirk stated that TPA Milestone M-026-07C addressed tritium that is present in groundwater; however, he noted that tritiated water originating from evaporated tank wastes are not covered, and alternatives 2 and 3 are not allowed. Studies done at the Hanford Site have demonstrated that tritium moves from State Approved Land Disposal Sites and the Treated Effluent Disposal Facility into groundwater and then into the Columbia River within approximately four to six years.

Joni noted that the ETF will be transitioned from the U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) to DOE-ORP so that the facility can be brought up to standards. Joni also recognized that the ETF is not currently functioning, but it will not delay upcoming evaporator campaigns.

The committee discussed adding this topic to the HAB Work Plan, but committee members did not agree that the HAB should discuss this issue at this time. Members noted that from a risk perspective, the tritiated water poses little biological risk. Members also cited a concern that the HAB is not responsible for enforcing law, and that regulators should manage this issue for the time being.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Supplemental Treatment

Liz Mattson recognized that a past question surrounding the WTP involved its ability to vitrify all of the wastes currently contained in Hanford Site tank farms. Liz asked if this was still an ongoing issue. Joni provided further detail, noting that the LAW Facility (where 80% of tank wastes will be processed) will not be sufficient to treat all of the LAW currently on-site. The Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS provided supplemental treatment options for wastes that the LAW Facility could not treat, but there was never any Record of Decision released on any of these supplemental treatment strategies, as Ecology was primarily interested in vitrification as an end-goal for all Hanford Site waste. Joni recognized that this issue was still an ongoing discussion between DOE-ORP and Ecology, and she stated that Consent Decree discussions integrate this topic.

Committee Business

Committee Leadership Nomination Process

Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues, reminded the committee that leadership positions for HAB committees were open. Ryan requested that any names put forward be those of individuals who have accepted the nomination, and he noted that self-nominations were admissible. Election of new committee leadership will take place at the March 2015 TWC meeting, and new TWC leadership will begin serving in April. EnviroIssues will consolidate leadership nominations and distribute the list of names to TWC membership for consideration.

*TWC 3-Month Work Plan****

The committee requested a meeting in March that will tentatively include the following topics:

- WTP One System Management Approach (DOE-ORP presentation)
- Tank Vapor Implementation Plan (Washington River Protection Solutions presentation, joint discussion with Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee)
- Issue manager update on the Cesium Storage Report

In April, TWC plans to meet to tentatively discuss the C-Farm swim lanes, risk-based retrieval EIS/Performance Assessment comparison, leadership retreat topics, issue manager updates on the WTP Communication Plan and the Cesium Storage Report, and the PHOENIX program as it relates to tank farms.

* **Attachment 1**: Transcribed Flipcharts
* **Attachment 2**: Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2015 Work Plan (Q2 and Q3 Action/Product Summary and FY 2015 Action Overview)
* **Attachment 3**: TWC 3-Month Work Plan

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flipcharts

Attachment 2: Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2015 Work Plan (Q2 and Q3 Action/Product Summary and FY 2015 Action Overview)

Attachment 3: TWC 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

David Bernhard	Susan Leckband	Maynard Plahuta
Shelley Cimon	Jonathan Matthews	Richard Smith
Dirk Dunning	Kristin McNall (phone)	Bob Suyama
John Howieson	Melanie Myers	
Steve Hudson (phone)	Liz Mattson (phone)	

Others:

Kris Skopeck, DOE-RL	Heather John, Ecology	Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
Joni Grindstaff, DOE-ORP	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP	Earl Fordham, WDOH	Emily Bays, Hanford Challenge
	Tom Rodgers, WDOH	Jennifer Copeland, MSA
		Steve Beehler, Northwind/DOE-ORP
		Sharon Braswell, Northwind/DOE-ORP
		Don Bouchey, Public